



8/ly for
Reconsider
3-24-04
NP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Amichai HEINES, et al.
Serial Number: 09/914,894
Filed: September 4, 2001
For: MICRO-MECHANICAL FLAT PANEL DISPLAY WITH TOUCH
SENSITIVE INPUT AND VIBRATION SOURCE
Art Unit: 2674
Examiner: Abbas I ABDULSELAM

RECEIVED

MAR 23 2004

Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Sir:

Further to an official action dated November 13, 2003, the following is applicants' response:

REMARKS

A terminal disclaimer, to overcome the double patenting rejection of claims 1-3 is enclosed herewith. Applicants note that the Examiner has presented a non-statutory double patenting rejection apparently based on the use of the term "hinge" in claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 66 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that Webb does not provide a *prima facie* case for obviousness.

The Webb patent utilizes a single electrode to deflect the panel. Even agreeing arguendo with the Examiner that the deflection of Webb is the same as the flipping of the claim, Webb still does not teach the invention. As indicated clearly at col. 2, lines 27-41 of Webb, the only electrification utilized in the flipping operation of Webb is a voltage applied between the hinge and the address electrode. Electrode 14 is a landing electrode and there is no teaching of any voltage being applied to this electrode either for flipping or for reduction of the stiction. Webb *does* recognize that stiction is a problem. However, Webb counteracts stiction by coating the landing electrode with a non-stick coating 26.